

1  
2  
3  
4 MIGUEL A. CISNEROS,  
5 Plaintiff,  
6 v.  
7 JIM ROBERTSON,  
8 Defendant.

9 Case No. 20-cv-07861-HSG  
10  
11

**ORDER ADDRESSING RECENT  
PLEADINGS**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 41, 43, 44, 46

12  
13 Petitioner, an inmate at Salinas Valley State Prison, filed this *pro se* action seeking a writ  
14 of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On February 9, 2022, the Court denied  
15 Respondent's motion to dismiss the petition as untimely but granted the motion to dismiss the  
16 petition as procedurally defaulted, denied a certificate of appealability, and granted judgment in  
17 favor of Respondent. Dkt. Nos. 32, 33. Since the dismissal, Petitioner has filed numerous  
18 pleadings in the record, requesting reconsideration of the dismissal. On April 11, 2022, the Court  
19 denied the four post-judgment motions docketed at Dkt. Nos. 34, 35, 36, 37, in a reasoned order.  
20 Dkt. No. 42.

21 Since the April 22, 2022 denial of the four post-judgment motions docketed at Dkt. Nos.  
22 34, 35, 36, 37, Petitioner has filed additional pleadings with the Court, Dkt. Nos. 41, 43, 44, 46,  
23 and has also filed a notice of appeal with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, Dkt. No. 45. Dkt.  
24 Nos. 41 and 43 "advised" the Court that Petitioner had timely filed post-judgment motions for  
25 reconsideration pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) and 60(b) and expressed concern that he had not  
26 received a decision or response from the Court. Dkt. Nos. 44 and 46 reiterate his concerns that he  
27 was not appointed counsel to assist him in this action despite his many disabilities and limitations  
28 and his lack of knowledge regarding the law, and again argue that the Court's dismissal of his

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 petition was incorrect, erroneous, and just plain wrong. He states that he has responded to all of  
2 the Court's concerns regarding his petition, and that he has plainly demonstrated that he is entitled  
3 to relief. Dkt. Nos. 44, 46. In dismissing the petition as procedurally defaulted, the Court  
4 carefully considered the record and the governing caselaw. The arguments raised in Dkt. Nos. 44  
5 and 46 are variations on the arguments raised previously by Petitioner in his numerous pleadings.  
6 The Court has already considered and denied these arguments. Accordingly, to the extent that  
7 Dkt. Nos. 44 and 46 are again seeking reconsideration of the Court's dismissal of the petition, the  
8 renewed request for reconsideration is DENIED. Any future pleadings filed by Petitioner  
9 requesting reconsideration of the dismissal and repeating arguments previously raised will be  
10 summarily denied. Similarly, any pleadings "advising" the Court that Petitioner has filed motions,  
11 that Petitioner has not received a response to his motions, or that Petitioner requires legal  
12 assistance will be summarily denied. This case remains closed.

13 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14 Dated: 6/2/2022

15   
16 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.  
17 United States District Judge

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28